

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment changes claim 1 so that the amount of the second cycloolefin copolymer is recited as "from about 0.5 to about 10% by weight, based on the total weight of the resin", as supported on page 8, lines 17 and 20 of the specification and original claim 9, rather than "up to 10% by weight" which has been interpreted in the Office Action as including zero percent or the complete absence of the second cycloolefin copolymer from the composition. It is submitted that this Amendment should be entered since it does not present any new issues in view of the fact that the "from 0.5 to about 10% by weight" range is already present in allowed claim 9.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The allowance of claims 9, 10 and 12-18, and the holding that dependent claims 3-5 and 8 are drawn to allowable subject matter, are gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over *Sagane et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,270,393).

As indicated previously, claim 1 and by extension, its dependent claims 2, 6, 7 and 19 have been interpreted prior to this amendment as including compositions in which the resin consists of only the recited first cycloolefin copolymer having a glass transition temperature of about 100-220°C and an intrinsic viscosity of about 5-1000 ml/g, with the recited second cycloolefin copolymer not being present at all. Thus, these claims were rejected as anticipated by or, in the alternative, rendered obvious by the disclosure of *Sagane et al.* '393 which includes, for instance in Example 3, a description of a composition containing a cycloolefin copolymer having a glass transition temperature of 151°C and an intrinsic viscosity of 50 ml/g. However, the foregoing amendment further limits these claims to compositions containing 0.5-10% by weight of a second cycloolefin copolymer having a glass transition temperature greater than 50°C but at least 25°C lower than that of the first cycloolefin, as well as from about 0.01% to about 3% of a fatty acid ester of an aliphatic polyhydric alcohol as lubricant and being

substantially free of zinc stearate. As shown in Tables 1 and 2 on pages 14 and 15 of the Applicants' specification, compositions meeting all the limitations of claim 1, as amended (E<sub>1</sub> and E<sub>2</sub>) have much less splay and/or considerably lower yellowness index (YI) percent haze and Hunter b Color Value (less than 1.0) than compositions not meeting all the limitations of claim 1, for example those not having a second cycloolefin copolymer within Applicants' range (C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>3</sub>) those not containing a fatty acid ester of an aliphatic polyhydric alcohol as lubricant (C<sub>1</sub>, C<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>4</sub>) and/or those containing a significant amount (0.05%) of zinc stearate (C<sub>4</sub> and C<sub>5</sub>). It is submitted that this is an unobvious result supporting the patentability of these claims. In this connection, it appears that claim 9 and its dependent claims, although differing somewhat from claim 1 in language and ranges, were allowed for the same reason.

In view of the above amendments and Remarks, this application is believed in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner would like to discuss this case, the Examiner is invited to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael W. Ferrell  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 31,158

Ferrells, PLLC  
P.O. Box 312  
Clifton, Virginia 20124-1706  
Telephone: 703-968-8600  
Facsimile: 703-968-5500  
August 13, 2004